DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 280 UD 018 317

AUTHOR Irwin, Paul M.
TITLE An Analysis of "Compensatory Education Services."
INSTITUTION Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Congressional Research Service.
PUB DATE 1 Feb 78
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; *Program Content; *Program Descriptions; Pupil Personnel Services; *School Services
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This analysis of a report on compensatory education prepared by the National Institute of Education (NIE) reviews special compensatory education services for participating students. The report reviewed describes student selection procedures, recipients of compensatory services, and types of services provided by compensatory education programs. The discussion includes both Title I programs and similar programs operated by 16 states. The findings are based on a survey of 100 school districts, on followup studies of auxiliary services in 18 of these districts, and on a comparison of regular instruction and compensatory projects in 12 special demonstration school districts. The NIE discussion regarding Title I is limited to the services purchased through basic grants to school districts. (Author/AM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED155280

CRS

78-53 ED

# AN ANALYSIS OF "COMPENSATORY EDUCATION SERVICES"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PAUL M. IRWIN
Analyst in Education
Education and Public Welfare Division

February 1, 1978

ED018317

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CRS

The Congressional Research Service works exclusively for the Congress, conducting research, analyzing legislation, and providing information at the request of Committees, Members and their staffs.

The Service makes such research available, without partisan bias, in many forms including studies, reports, compilations, digests, and background briefings. Upon request, the CRS assists Committees in analyzing legislative proposals and issues, and in assessing the possible effects of these proposals and their alternatives. The Service's senior specialists and subject analysts are also available for personal consultations in their respective fields of expertise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Foreword | i |
| I. Summary of Findings | 2 |
| A. Student Selection Procedures | 3 |
| B. Recipients of Compensatory Services | 3 |
| C. Types of Services | 4 |
| D. Special Demonstration School Districts | 7 |
| II. Recommendations | 8 |
| III. Implications | 9 |
| A. Eligible Children and Additional Funding | 9 |
| B. "Pullout" Programs | 11 |
| C. Nonpublic Participation | 12 |
| IV. Research Limitations | 14 |
| A. The Type of School District | 14 |
| B. The Size of the Sample | 15 |
| C. The Accuracy of the National Estimates | 17 |
| D. The Lack of Data for More Than One School Year | 18 |
| E. Special Demonstration School Districts | 19 |
| V. Context of the Report | 20 |

FOREWORD

A study of the fundamental purposes and effectiveness of compensatory education was mandated by the Education Amendments of 1974. The Congress made the National Institute of Education (NIE) responsible for investigating both the Title I program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and similar programs funded by some of the States.

The legislation authorizing the NIE study does not specifically define "compensatory education," but the ESEA Title I declaration of policy has sometimes been considered a useful guideline:

> In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. [Section 101, ESEA]

ESEA Title I is the largest Federal program for elementary and secondary education; more than $20 billion have been appropriated for the Title I program in its first 13 years (fiscal years 1966-78), and the fiscal year 1979 appropriation would be $2.735 billion under the provisions of P.L. 95-205 (Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1978). The fiscal year 1979 Administration budget proposal includes a Title I request for $2.979 billion for fiscal year 1980, plus $400 million for proposed additions to the Title I legislation.

Compensatory education programs in nearly 90 percent (about 14,000) of the Nation's school districts, plus some 240 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools, are funded through Title I. Approximately five million public school children, 225,000 private school children, and 31,000 BIA school children participate in these programs.

In its report of December 1976, the NIE found that 16 States operated compensatory education programs during the 1975-76 school year, with a funding level of $600 million ("Evaluating Compensatory Education," p. III-13).

MAY 1 8 1978

# AN ANALYSIS OF "COMPENSATORY EDUCATION SERVICES"[1/]

This report by the National Institute of Education (NIE) is one of six constituting the September 30, 1977, interim report to the President and the Congress on a comprehensive study of compensatory education.[2/] The NIE study has identified three specific "fundamental purposes" of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA):

(1) To provide financial assistance to school districts in relation to their numbers of low-income children and, within those districts, to the schools with the greatest numbers of low-income children;

(2) To fund special services for low-achieving children in the poorest schools; and

(3) To contribute to the cognitive, emotional, social, or physical development of participating students. 3/

The focus of this NIE report is primarily on the last two objectives -- the special compensatory education services and the participating students. The characteristics of both Title I and similar State programs are discussed. (In the following discussion, "Title I" will refer only to the Federal program, and "compensatory" to both Title I and the State programs.)

---

1/ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Education. Compensatory Education Services. Washington, July 31, 1977.

2/ The six parts of the September 1977 interim report describe selected aspects of the overall NIE study, including the allocation of funds, compensatory education services, student development, and the administration of compensatory education programs. Greater detail about the scope of the study, the interim report, and the bills introduced in the 95th Congress to extend Title I may be found in Section V of this analysis.

3/ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Education. Evaluating Compensatory Education. Washington, December 30, 1976. p. xiii.

This analysis contains a summary of findings, recommendations, implications, research limitations, and context of the report.

I. Summary of Findings

"Compensatory Education Services" describes student selection procedures, recipients of compensatory services, and types of services provided by compensatory education programs. The discussion includes both Title I programs and similar programs operated by 16 States. The findings are based on a survey of 100 school districts, on followup studies of auxiliary services in 18 of these districts, and a comparison of regular instruction and compensatory projects in 12 special demonstration school districts. The NIE discussion regarding Title I is limited to the services purchased through basic grants to school districts, grants that account for 81 percent of the Title I appropriation.

As identified by the NIE, one of the major purposes of the ESEA Title I legislation has been the funding of compensatory education services. The report shows that this purpose is being achieved. Most of the funds are spent by the school districts on instructional services, and only a small portion of the funds are spent for auxiliary services. Furthermore, the report claims that the compensatory services found in the survey are generally considered to contribute to the overall quality of education.[4/]

The report first describes the student selection procedures of compensatory education programs and the characteristics of recipients found in a sample of 100 school districts. The types of services in the 100 districts

---

4/ Another NIE report in this series, "The Effects of Services on Student Development," addresses the relation between instructional services and student achievement.

are described next, including instructional and auxiliary compensatory services (18 of the 100 districts were selected for a more detailed investigation of these auxiliary services). The report also compares compensatory with noncompensatory instruction in 12 special demonstration school districts that were not part of the larger sample.

A. Student Selection Procedures

School districts were found to have considerable flexibility in the procedures used to select recipients of compensatory education services. All ESEA Title I school districts in the sample reportedly were using achievement test scores as one basis for selection, but such scores were often available only for one or two grade levels. In addition, 89 percent of the districts also used teacher judgment, 36 percent used economic criteria, and 26 percent used other procedures such as referral by social service agencies.

The NIE report estimates that about two-thirds of all students determined to be eligible for services actually participated in ESEA Title I programs. It also found that, when State compensatory education programs funded services along with the Federal program, about 75 percent of eligible students received services.

B. Recipients of Compensatory Services

Compensatory education program recipients were examined in the sample of 100 school districts, and it was estimated that nearly 20 percent of all public school students were receiving some type of services

from the programs. The proportions of recipients on the average tended to be less white and more black or Spanish-surnamed than the proportions of these students in national enrollment figures. Compensatory education services were provided to only four percent of all nonpublic school students in the districts surveyed.

C. Types of Services

All districts in the sample were found to use compensatory program funds to support instructional services, and about half of the districts also provided some auxiliary non-instructional services. About 75 percent of the average school district's ESEA Title I budget was estimated to be spent for compensatory instructional services. These services generally emphasized basic skills of reading, language arts and mathematics; 85 percent of all compensatory students were found to be receiving compensatory instruction in reading or language arts, and 44 percent were found to be receiving compensatory instruction in mathematics.

Four characteristics of instructional services are described in some detail: class size, time spent in instruction, teacher characteristics, and individualized instruction. While noting that considerable variation was found among the sample of 100 school districts, the NIE study judges compensatory instructional services to be special in each of the following characteristics:[5/]

-Class sizes are small. They average 9 students in compensatory reading and 12 in mathematics and language arts, compared with 27 in homeroom classes.

---

5/ U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Education. Compensatory Education Services. p. vii.

-Compensatory education students spend an average of 5-1/2 hours per week in special instruction. That amounts tc 29 percent of total instructional time for students in reading, 22 percent for students in language arts, and 27 percent for those in mathematics.

-Professional teachers who deliver compensatory instruction are often highly qualified: 67 percent have graduate training beyond a bachelor's degree, and 62 percent specialize in teaching one subject. Teacher's aides deliver a substantial portion of compensatory instruction. More than half the aides employed nationwide are paid from ESEA Title I funds.

-Many school districts attempt to individualize their instruction, although few districts offer instruction that could be considered individualized in all respects.

The NIE report also examines the incidence of "pullout" programs, where students are removed from their regular classrooms to receive special instructional services. On the basis of the 100 school districts, almost 75 percent of the compensatory reading programs were found to use this method, but less than half of the language arts and mathematics programs used "pullout" techniques. It was found that students in "pullout" programs were more likely to miss some or all of their regular instruction than those who received compensatory instruction in their regular classrooms.

Patterns of expenditures and services were analyzed in the districts surveyed. Expenditures were found to be directly proportional to the number of students served, and "pullout" instructional programs were more prevalent in districts with larger ESEA Title I budgets.

Noninstructional auxiliary services accounted for less than 5 percent of the ESEA Title I budget in the average school district. The survey of 100 districts indicated that about one third of the funds for

auxiliary services was spent for parent involvement activities, including parent advisory councils, and another third was spent for counseling and social work. The remaining third of the auxiliary services budget was divided between health and other services, including transportation and food.

In followup case studies of 18 districts from the 100 district sample, the characteristics of auxiliary services were examined. It was found that the percentage of ESEA Title I budgets spent for auxiliary services has been shrinking over the past four years, and declines of up to 80 percent in the number of students served were reported. The 18 districts provided some explanations as to why the decrease was occurring, such as the Federal requirement that services be supplemental (districts reported difficulty showing that auxiliary services were truly supplemental); a renewed emphasis on basic skills; financial pressures; and program evaluations. It was stated that quantitative measures of the effects of auxiliary services were more difficult to assess than measures for other kinds of services. Some pressures to resist the budget decreases for auxiliary services were reported from two sources. First, local needs assessments were often found to support the continuation, expansion, or initiation of auxiliary services; and second, the changes in the ESEA Title I legislation in 1974 resulted in an increased emphasis on parent advisory councils.

In addition to the 75 percent for instructional services and 5 percent for auxiliary services, the NIE study estimated that the remaining 20 percent of the entire ESEA Title I budget was spent for other

purposes, including additional salaries, fringe benefits, equipment, operation and maintenance, and capital outlays. The NIE report contains no analysis of these expenditures.

D. Special Demonstration School Districts

On the basis of 12 special demonstration school districts (which were not part of the 100 district sample), some comparisons are made by the NIE of compensatory and noncompensatory instruction. Since this survey was small, non-randomly selected, and not nationally representative, the findings must be treated only as suggestive. Nine districts were found where Title I students received more language arts instruction per day than non-Title I students, but 2 districts were found where the instructional time was equal, and 1 district was found where the Title I students received less instructional time per day. When comparisons are made regarding class size and teacher training, ESEA Title I students in the 12 districts do in fact seem to receive more services overall than other students.

II. Recommendations

The focus of "Compensatory Education Services" is on the procedures used for selecting recipients of compensatory education services and on the kinds of services provided through compensatory education programs. This report makes no explicit recommendations for legislative action. (The NIE is obligated to make recommendations as part of the overall study, but the final report is not due until September 30, 1978.)

III. Implications

Several aspects of the current ESEA Title I program are described in the NIE report that might be of particular interest to the Congress, including:

- the percentage of eligible children actually served by the program and the related claim that additional funding would serve more children;
- the frequency with which compensatory programs pull eligible children out of their regular classrooms;
- the low participation of nonpublic schoolchildren in Title I programs.

A. Eligible Children and Additional Funding

The NIE report shows that not all eligible children receive ESEA Title I services. The study reported estimates of participants and eligibles in Title I schools, and found that only two-thirds of the eligibles actually participated in the programs. In districts receiving State compensatory education funds, participation rates were somewhat higher -- about 75 percent. These figures indicate that unmet needs exist in programs for educationally deprived children.

These NIE findings are not necessarily at variance with the purposes of ESEA Title I. The ESEA legislation does not contain provisions for fully funding programs to serve the unmet needs of all eligible children. Rather, the legislation authorizes "financial assistance" for programs that "contribute" toward meeting the educational needs of educationally deprived children (section 101, ESEA); local entitlement for assistance

is based on a 40 percent Federal share of the average cost of educating children; and there is a provision for adjusting the allocations formula whenever appropriations are insufficient to fund the total entitlement (the appropriations have been less than entitlements since the first year of the ESEA Title I program). The NIE estimation of eligible children who do not participate might be used to justify requirements for more widely distributed services or to justify appropriations at a higher level, but it does not directly indicate a lack of accomplishment of the objectives of the program.

The NIE report also shows that districts with higher levels of Title I funding (i.e., more dollars from Title I), served more children than those with smaller budgets. This finding is used to support a claim that higher levels of Title I funding would probably serve more students.[6/] While this assertion might be accurate, it is not supported by the original finding. The NIE survey of 100 districts did not measure the effects of an increase in the Title I budget of the school districts under investigation; it only measured school districts with Title I budgets of different sizes, and found that those with larger budgets served proportionally more students.

The NIE study does not give an actual number or estimate of the number of children that are eligible for Title I services but do not

---

6/ Ibid., p. 11. This report does not indicate the relationship between the size of a district's Title I budget and the district's enrollment, total expenditures, or number of poor children counted for allocating the Title I budget to the district.

receive them. Such a number could be calculated from the NIE survey, but it would not be useful for some policy purposes, such as estimating the additional funds needed to provide services for all eligible children. The estimate would have marginal value because school districts have some flexibility under Federal regulations to determine how many schools qualify for Title I, and how many children are eligible and served within those schools.

B. "Pullout" Programs

Compensatory instruction (both ESEA Title I and State funded programs) was often found to involve "pullout" programs, where participating students were removed from their regular classrooms to receive special instruction. Almost 25 percent of all compensatory students were found to spend the entire school day in classrooms solely composed of other compensatory students. The combination of findings that pullout students tend to miss regular instruction more frequently than non-pullout students and that compensatory education students are more likely to be of racial or ethnic minority than the enrollment at large might be considered an unwanted consequence of the program. Some might argue that the possible impact of tracking, isolation, and segregation of compensatory students from regular students outweighs any benefits obtained through pullout instruction. Others might claim that compensatory services are most efficiently administered through separate instructional methods.

C. Nonpublic Participation

A low rate of ESEA Title I participation of nonpublic schoolchildren was reported by the NIE survey. It was estimated that only 4 percent of nonpublic elementary schoolchildren participate, compared with nearly 20 percent of public schoolchildren. Furthermore, the nonpublic children received an average of approximately one hour per week of compensatory instruction, compared to an average of 5-1/2 hours per week for public school students. It was also found that only 43 percent of all ESEA Title I districts were providing any Title I services to nonpublic students. However, not all public school districts have nonpublic students enrolled in schools within the district, and nonpublic students may be less disadvantaged than public school students. The NIE report does not contain any statistics to shed light on these questions.

Some background information may be useful in assessing the significance of the NIE finding of low participation of nonpublic schoolchildren in Title I programs. The ESEA Title I legislation requires that public school districts provide services to nonpublic schoolchildren who are educationally deprived on a basis that is consistent with the number of such children (Section 141A, ESEA). If a school district is prohibited by law from providing these services, or if the U.S. Commissioner of Education determines that a district has failed to provide such services, then the Commissioner is required to make alternate arrangements to provide such services. The NIE report suggests that school districts have encountered problems with these provisions. 7/

7/ Ibid., p. 15.

However, since apparently no comparison was made of the relative disadvantage of public and nonpublic students, and no count was made of school districts that are prohibited by law from providing services, that have failed to provide services, or that do not have any nonpublic students, there is little that can be concluded from the NIE findings about compliance with the Title I nonpublic student provisions. The report does not provide any estimate of the number of nonpublic children served through alternate arrangements by the Commissioner of Education. Because of the variation in size of public school districts, a characteristic found in 43 percent of the districts might apply to as few as 5 percent or as many as 90 percent of the total enrollment.[8/] A similar range for nonpublic students can be reasonably expected.

Beyond these particular questions about the services currently provided by the ESEA Title I program, some other aspects of Title I services do not appear to have been addressed by the NIE report. There is little analysis of the educational effectiveness of the services described or of the efficiency with which the services have been purchased. There is no discussion of alternatives to the services now provided by school districts and no assessment of the relative value of instructional versus auxiliary services. An analysis of the services that might have been purchased with the same funds but without the Federal ESEA Title I restrictions might also have been useful in this report.

---

8/ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Center for Education Statistics. Education Directory Public School Systems 1975-76. Washington (NCES 76-153), 1976. p. xvi.

## IV. Research Limitations

The design of a research project in general, and of survey research in particular, imposes certain restrictions and limitations on the inferences that can be made from the data thereby collected. With regard to the research that underlies this report, the limitations are based on the type of school district sampled in the survey, the size of the sample itself, the accuracy of the national estimates, and the lack of data for more than one school year. There are also special limitations on the inferences that can be made from small numbers of demonstration school districts. Although the NIE report discusses some of these issues, it may be useful in this analysis of the report to review the major limitations inherent in the NIE surveys.

### A. The Type of School District

Most of the NIE findings are based on a survey of 100 school districts selected from approximately 14,000 school districts with ESEA Title I programs in kindergarten through eighth grades. More than 2,000 school districts are thereby excluded, falling into two categories: (1) districts serving only grades 9 through 12 with Title I programs; and (2) districts without Title I programs.

The first exclusion prevents generalization of the NIE research findings to all ESEA Title I districts or programs. Although most Title I programs are apparently represented by the NIE sample, no estimates can be presented of the number of eligible or participating children in grades

9 through 12. Perhaps the Title I services provided to these children are proportional to their educational needs, but there is no basis for this conclusion in the NIE report.

The exclusion of districts without Title I programs means that comparisons cannot be made between districts with such programs and those without. Such comparisons are often considered helpful in evaluating the overall effectiveness of a program. For example, the NIE study found that compensatory education class sizes were "small" and that homeroom sizes were larger, but there are no comparable data to show the size of regular, noncompensatory classes or homerooms. Likewise, there are no data showing the training of noncompensatory teachers or the amount of individualized instruction in regular classes, nor are there data to show the numbers of low-achieving students who are pulled out of classrooms for specialized but noncompensatory instruction.

B. The Size of the Sample

The question might be asked whether there were a sufficient number of districts in the NIE sample to make generalizations about the 14,000 districts under study (100 districts were selected for analyzing compensatory instruction, and from these 18 were picked for intensive analysis of auxiliary services; the NIE separately selected 12 special demonstration school districts, and they will be discussed in a later section). There is no statistically "correct" solution to the question of sample size, and the answer depends in part on the variability of the data collected and on the objectives of the analysis.

The underlying variability of the data is an important consideration in determining the proper sample size. Clearly, if there were no variation among school districts, then a sample of one district would be sufficient for analysis. With greater variation among districts, larger samples become necessary. Likewise, some analytic objectives require larger samples than others; for example, greater accuracy in estimating national totals requires larger samples (this topic will be discussed below). The analysis or comparison of many aspects of school programs can also require larger samples than the study of only a few such aspects.

Selecting the proper sample size can involve a trade-off in priorities between analysis and cost; a larger sample may allow more analysis but almost certainly will cost more. The kinds of analyses which were not made in the NIE report may perhaps be indicative of an insufficient sample size (although reporting deadlines may also have been a consideration). The NIE report does not contain any analyses of regional variation in compensatory education programs. There are few comparisons of services in large and small districts, in rich or poor districts, or in urban, suburban, or rural districts. There is no analysis of Federal versus State compensatory education programs. Some discussion of these issues might be expected in a study of ESEA Title I.

It may be useful to compare the NIE sample size with sample sizes used by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to study school district finances, pupils, and staff. A sample of 5,128 districts

was selected in a 1969-70 study of finances, while only 933 districts were selected for a 1972-73 study of finances (the larger sample was necessary for State and national estimates while the smaller sample was used for national estimates only).[9/] An NCES study of pupils and staff in 1971 used a sample of 2,541 districts (for making national estimates).[10/] To evaluate the sustaining effects of ESEA Title I programs for elementary school students, a recent Office of Education study sampled about 5,000 elementary schools (out of a total of over 62,000 such schools).[11/]

C. The Accuracy of the National Estimates

A sample of school districts can be used to estimate a national total; different samples of districts would produce slightly different estimates. The accuracy of such estimates can be evaluated by means of the "standard error," a term that can be calculated from the sample data. The standard error provides a range about the estimate that is likely to contain the actual number being estimated. The likelihood that the range contains the actual number can be estimated at varying probabilities -- these are called "confidence levels." As an illustration, the NIE

---

9/ U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Center for Educational Statistics. Statistics of Local Public School Systems, Finance, 1969-70. Washington (74-147), 1974; and U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Center for Education Statistics. Statistics of Local Public School Systems, Finance, 1972-73. Washington (NCES 76-156), 1976.

10/ U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Center for Education Statistics. Statistics of Local Public School Systems: Pupils and Staff, Fall 1971. Washington (NCES 76-146), undated.

11/ Hoepfner, Ralph, Jean Wellisch, and Henry Zagorski. Report #1: The Sample for Sustaining Effects Study and Projections of Its Characteristics to the National Population. System Development Corporation. Santa Monica, March 1977.

estimates that the number of pupils receiving ESEA Title I services is 66 percent of the number of program eligibles in Title I schools, with a standard error of .05 at the 95 percent confidence level.[12/] This means that the actual number is expected to be within the range of 61 and 71 percent, and if similar intervals were calculated from repeated samples, the actual number would be contained by those intervals 95 percent of the time. Confidence levels can be increased, for example, to 99 percent, but the interval of the estimate is increased accordingly. An increase in the accuracy of the estimate, meaning a smaller interval or standard error, can usually be obtained by increasing the size of the sample. Standard errors have been calculated and presented in the NIE report in less than half the tables where they might have been appropriate, and the text of the report seldom reminds the reader that the numbers presented are in fact estimates or projections and not the actual numbers themselves.

D. The Lack of Data for More Than One School Year

The NIE survey of 100 school districts collected data for a single school year (1975-76). Without multi-year data, however, an analysis of the effects of budgetary change in the Title I program is virtually impossible. An analysis of change would require information concerning the decisions that individual school districts might make relative to the expansion, contraction, or termination of existing programs or the

---

12/ U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Education. Compensatory Education Services, p. 11.

introduction of a new program. It is a questionable assumption that the pattern of behavior for a single district over two or more years can be simulated on the basis of a pattern found in a single year in several districts with budgets of different sizes. The inferences that can be made from single year and multi-year studies are different -- a distinction apparently overlocked in the NIE report.[13/]

E. Special Demonstration School Districts

The NIE report compares compensatory education instruction in reading and language arts with regular instruction, but it does so on the basis of a survey of 12 special demonstration school districts.[14/] Moreover, these districts were not scientifically selected; rather, they elected to participate under a special legislative provision that allows greater flexibility (than under normal program regulations) for the district's allocation of ESEA Title I funds to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children. Since these districts were neither randomly selected nor nationally representative, the NIE is prevented from treating the findings as anything other than tentative or suggestive. The legislative mandate required that not more than 20 districts would be eligible for the special demonstration program. However, comparison of Title I programs with regular instruction could have been accomplished from a larger, scientifically selected sample of districts. Following such a procedure might have made the overall study more useful.

---

13/ See especially pages viii and 11-12, where NIE asserts the finding that, as Title I expenditures increase, districts serve more students.

14/ Thirteen districts are participating in the demonstration, but too few students were sampled in the 13th district to make reliable estimates about language arts instruction.

V. Context of the Report

One of the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1974 required that the NIE make a study of the purposes and effectiveness of compensatory education (section 821, Public Law 93-380). Specifically, the study shall include:

a. an examination of the fundamental purposes of compensatory education;

b. an analysis of the means to identify the children with the greatest need for such programs;

c. an analysis of the effectiveness of methods and procedures for meeting the educational needs of such children;

d. an exploration of alternative methods for distributing compensatory education funds to States and school districts in a timely and effective manner;

e. not more than 20 experimental programs, geographically representative, to assist the NIE in carrying out the purposes of this study; and

f. findings and recommendations, including recommendations for changes in ESEA Title I or for new legislation.

Funding for the NIE study amounted to $15 million, to be obligated during fiscal years 1975 through 1977. As amended by Public Law 94-482, the law requires the NIE to submit interim reports to the President and the Congress on December 31, 1976, and on September 30, 1977, and to submit a final report on September 30, 1978.

Six reports constitute the NIE interim report of September 1977. These are entitled:

"Administration of Compensatory Education"

"Compensatory Education Services"

"Demonstration Studies of Funds Allocation Within Districts"

"The Effects of Services on Student Development"

"Title I Funds Allocation: The Current Formula"

"Using Achievement Test Scores to Allocate Title I Funds"

The interim report of December 1976 is entitled "Evaluating Compensatory Education." It discusses NIE's strategy for the overall study and presents preliminary findings of a survey of compensatory educational services in 100 school districts.

The NIE has designed 35 research projects to make a comprehensive response to the mandates of the legislation. The specific projects, the contractors, and the completion dates of each project are described in Appendix B of "Evaluating Compensatory Education." The NIE has divided the projects into four major areas of inquiry:

a. funds allocation research, including alternate measures of poverty, not more than 20 experimental programs for school districts (16 districts participated in the first year, 13 in the second year), a computerized simulation model, an analysis of the relationship between poverty and educational achievement, the distributional consequences of using student achievement measures, and the subcounty allocation process;

b. research on services, including a survey of compensatory education in 100 school districts, case studies on noninstructional services provided under ESEA Title I, and a teacher-training study;

c. research concerning effects on children, including alternative approaches to education, such as cross-age tutoring, client-controlled elementary schools, the extent of parental involvement, and some studies of teaching basic skills in reading and mathematics; and

d. administration, including a study of the Federal administration of ESEA Title I, a survey of how States regulate ESEA Title I and State compensatory education programs, a case study on ESEA Title I and desegregation, a study of parent advisory councils, a study of the participation of nonpublic schoolchildren in compensatory education programs, a review of test bias and the classification of children. (A study of the problems of implementing ESEA Title I in rural schools was originally planned, but has been cancelled.)

The ESEA Title I authorization for appropriations was extended through fiscal year 1979 under the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1977 (P.L. 95-112, September 24, 1977). Without further Congressional action, section 414 of the General Education Provisions Act will automatically extend Title I for one additional year. Several bills have been introduced in the 95th Congress to extend Title I authorization for additional years, including:

H.R. 15 (Perkins), "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1977." Among other provisions, extends the Title I authorization through fiscal year 1983, making no other changes in Title I legislation.

S. 1753 (Pell), "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1977." Contains Title I provisions similar to H.R. 15.

H.R. 7571 (Quie), "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1977." Among other provisions, extends the Title I authorization through fiscal year 1982, but changes the purpose of Title I to provide financial assistance for programs that help overcome deficiencies in children's basic learning skills, and would allocate funds according to educational need as measured by an assessment of reading, mathematics, and language arts.

H.R. 9968 (Chisholm), "Title I Amendments Act of 1977." Among other provisions, extends the Title I authorization through fiscal year 1982, and provides for greater Title I parental involvement through the existing parent advisory councils, and modifies various Title I administrative requirements regarding State applications, audits, complaints, and the enforcement of provisions. Would also authorize certain additional summer education programs, parent education programs, and personnel retraining programs.

NOTE: A more current and detailed description of Congressional activity on the extension of ESEA Title I, including hearings, reports, legislation, and other Congressional action, may be found in:

U.S. Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by Robert F. Lyke. (Frequently updated) Issue Brief 77107.